## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN THE APPLICATION OF:

JACOB LAHIJANI

CASE NO.: FL0214USNA APPLICATION NO.: 10/719973

CONFIRMATION NO.: 3574 GROUP ART UNIT: 1712

EXAMINER: ROBERT A VETERE FILED: NOVEMBER 21, 2003

FOR: ROTOLINING PROCESS

## **RESPONSE TO ADVISORY ACTION**

## Via EFS-Web

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Upon review of the Advisory Action dated September 15, 2010, the undersigned realizes for the first time that the Examiner's basis for maintaining the final rejection is mistaken. If the Examiner were to agree in this regard, then the lengthy prosecution of this patent application could be ended.

The mistaken basis is the reliance on "Buckmaster teaches that the fluorine stabilization reduces evolution of volatiles during further use of the film."

Buckmaster does not disclose that further use of a film has any problem of volatiles evolution. Instead, Buckmaster discloses that the reduction in bubbling or evolution of volatiles is with respect to "further end-use heat processing [emphasis supplied]." (col. 2, 1. 34-38). Heat processing is the end use, not the further use. Heat processing is the melt fabrication of the copolymer as is seen from the following Buckmaster disclosure:

"They (the unstable end groups) have a tendency to cause bubbles or voids upon melt fabrication." (col. 4, 1, 40-41)

One skilled in the art knows that the TFE/PPVE copolymer of Buckmaster has a melting point of about 305°C and that melt fabrication is carried out at a much higher temperature than the melting temperature. Kazumi rotolines at a temperatures of 370°C to 410°C [0015].

Thus, one skilled in the art learns from Buckmaster that the evolution of volatiles is a problem arising in melt fabrication, not further use of the melt-fabricated article. Further use would of course not even reach the melting temperature of the lining, since that would lead to melt flow and destruction of the lining.

Application No.: 10/719973 Case No.: FL0214USNA Confirmation No.: 3574

RESPONSE TO ADVISORY ACTION

Kazumi, of course, does not need the fluorine stabilization of Buckmaster to make a bubble free lining, since Kazumi has already provided a bubble-free lining without fluorine stabilization.

Reconsideration of the mistaken interpretation of Buckmaster as discussed above and allowance of the claims of this patent application is respectfully urged.

A request for two-month extension of time and payment of the required fee is filed herewith.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edwin Tocker/

EDWIN TOCKER ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT Registration No.: 20,341 Telephone: (302) 999-3076 (302-892-7903 if no answer) Page 2

Facsimile: (302) 355-3982

Date: September 16, 2010